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Abstract

These are the minutes for the IEEE 802.11bd task group ad-hoc meeting on March 11, 2019.

The Monday AM1 session is an ad-hoc that takes place from 8-10am prior to the IEEE 802.11 opening plenary. Please see document [IEEE 802.11-19/0300](https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/19/11-19-0300) for minutes of the subsequent task group sessions at the March 2019 meeting.

**Minutes**

**Monday AM1**

1. Chair convened the meeting at 08:02 Pacific Daylight Time (PDT). 103 participants in the room.
2. **Agenda** (11-19-0237r2)
3. The chair read through the meeting protocols on slide #3 of the agenda.
4. **Patents**
5. The chair read the patent notices within the agenda.
6. There were no notifications from anyone regarding the call for essential patents.
7. **Participation**
8. The chair read the participation notice within the agenda.
9. **Changes to the agenda**
10. None
11. No objection to approving the agenda.
12. **Reply Liaison from 802.11 to the WFA** (11-18-2044r2)
13. This is an updated version of an earlier liaison
14. Question (Q): Will there be a future liaision describing what work 11bd has managed to do?
15. Answer (A): There’s no plan to do that at the moment.
16. There will be a motion to approve this liaison later this week.
17. A further liaison is required to be finished for SAE/IEEE 1609.
18. Comment (C): Can we look at the incoming liaison from IEEE 1609 please? However, will the topic of SAE/1609 liaisons be discussed later this week?
19. Chair: We have time to review the incoming liaison from IEEE 1609 now.
20. **Liaison from IEEE 1609** (11-19-0027r0)
21. The main theme of the incoming liaison from IEEE 1609 is that there should be a close relationship with IEEE 802.11bd.
22. Q: Is there any point in trying to arrange a face to face meeting between 11bd and 1609?
23. A: Yes, that’s a good idea.
24. C: I think both grops are very flexible in where and when this could occur. It doesn’t necessarily need to be co-located with an IEEE 802.11 meeting.
25. C: Irvine, CA in January 2020 would work. Another option would be a teleconference. Ever IEEE 802.11 could join a IEEE 1609 teleconference. The next IEEE 1609 meeting is the 13/14 April.
26. C: I’d like to mention the ETSI automotive group. Perhaps similar joint meetings with 802.11bd should also be considered.
27. A list of intererested external groups is as follows:
	1. ETSI TC ITS (owns ITS-G5 spec, which is the European equivalent of DSRC, so it explicitly references 802.11p)
	2. IEEE 1609 (middle layers, including 1609.4, which is multi-channel operatons)
	3. SAE DSRC Technical Committee (has the J2945/1 minimum performance requirements for DSRC, and J2735, the DSRC message set dictionary)
28. **Intro of 802.11bd for CITS** (11-19-0298r0)
29. This document describes IEEE 802.11bd for CITS.
30. Chair: If you are interested in co-existence between 802.11bd and 3GPP, please create a submission. This group is open for technical discussions.
31. Comment: This slide deck needs to be updated to include the document number.
32. A: Yes, ok.
33. **PHY designs for NGV** (11-19-0293r0)
34. Discussion of new PPDU formats for 802.11bd, together with doppler issues.
35. Q: On each set of results, what is on the x-axis please?
36. A: SNR
37. Q: Have you taken into account any color tracking models?
38. A: No
39. Q: Have you considered any throughput issues, as these may vary from your SNR results?
40. A: No
41. Q: Simulations so far have used fixed block size. Typically blocks of 200 – 800 bytes would occur in practice. Could this simulation be updated for that?
42. A: Yes, that would be interesting
43. Q: What’s your view about LDPC?
44. A: It’s a good candidate (as opposed to BCC), but has not been considered yet.
45. Q: On slide #5, I think the LTF sequence already includes the 2 GI, so the separate 2 GI sub-field is not required.
46. A: No, it is actually required.
47. **Selection Procedure** (11-19-0030r5)
48. This is an update of the procedure
49. The plan is to have a motion to approve this document during the main IEEE 802.11bd later in the week.
50. Q: Can the editor make changes to the draft specification without a motion? I think that is bad practice.
51. A: Yes.
52. Q: There appears to be a conflict between 3b and 3c.
53. A: The SFD was originally constructed for the larger groups, but does not apply to the smaller group. For example, 802.11ay did not use one.
54. C: I’d like to state that a specification framework document is a construct of a task group and not the working group. Rules about the specification framework document are created by each task group.
55. C: I agree with the earlier comment that a specifation framework document is not required.
56. C: I disagree and state that a specification framework document is required and very necessary.
57. C: The specification framework document is a task group document and just forms the basis of a technical specification document.
58. **Straw poll**:
59. Which of the following rules do you support for removing a feature from the SFD?
60. A: 50%
61. B: 75%
62. C: I would like to mention that the SFD is not a technical document, as it is not part of the specification itself.
63. C: I think the 802.11 CAC should discuss this.
64. Chair: The majority is for option B.
65. **Straw poll**:
66. Do you support deleting the following sentence from the 11bd selection procedure document (11-19-0030r5)?
67. “The editorial changes to the 802.11bd draft specification document shall not require a motion.”
68. The majority is yes.
69. Chair adjourned at 09:58

**Notes:**

Document numbers referenced (e.g. 802.11-19/0000r0) are available on IEEE Mentor: <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/documents>